



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/917,403	07/27/2001	John C. Alexander	C3355	4765

26648 7590 08/11/2003  
PHARMACIA CORPORATION  
GLOBAL PATENT DEPARTMENT  
POST OFFICE BOX 1027  
ST. LOUIS, MO 63006

EXAMINER

QAZI, SABIHA NAIM

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1616

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/917,403

Applicant(s)

ALEXANDER ET AL.

Examiner

Sabiha Qazi

Art Unit

1616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-51 (in-part) is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) 1-51 (in-part) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 1616

Acknowledgement is made of the response with the election with traverse of species filed in paper no. 5. Aldosterone receptor agonist elected is "eplerenone" (page 29, lines 26-34, described as compound 1 in Table 1 at page 17). Metoprolol is elected as beta-adrenergic antagonists (Table 2 at page 20 and at page 21, line 9). Claims 1-51 are pending. No claim is allowed at this time. No search can be carried out for compounds, which are only defined by the method for their identification.

Arguments about the restriction requirement were considered but were not found persuasive because a search for one combination likely will overlap with the search of other combinations when the compounds, which are combined, are different. Note, that these combinations of "aldosterone receptor agonists" and beta-adrenergic antagonists" can be any class of compounds. It would be an undue burden on the Examiner to search all the invention as presently claimed. Elected subject matter containing the combination of epoxy steroid eplerenone and metoprolol in claims 1-51 is considered allowable. Applicant is requested to amend the claims to a genus of elected subject matter.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-51 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject

Art Unit: 1616

matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

A combination of

1. aldosterone receptor antagonist and
2. beta-adrenergic antagonist is considered broad and encompass thousands of compounds and their combinations. Specification does not disclose all the antagonists as claimed.

The claims encompass a genus of compounds defined only by their function wherein the relationships between the structural features of the members of the genus and said function have not been defined. In absence of such a relationship either disclosed in the application or which would be based on the information readily available to one skilled in the art, the skilled artisan would not know how to make and use the invention that lacks structural definition.

The fact that one assay of the compound of interest using claimed assays does not overcome this defect since one would have no knowledge beforehand as to whether or not any given compound (other than those particularly disclosed in the present application) would fall within the scope of what is claimed.

It would require undue experimentation to randomly screen undefined compounds for the claimed activity.

The first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 states, "The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same..."

The courts have interpreted this to mean that the specification must enable one skilled in the art to make and use the invention without undue

experimentation. The courts have further interpreted undue experimentation as requiring “ingenuity beyond that to be expected of one of ordinary skill in the art” (Fields v. Conover, 170 USPQ 276 (CCPA 1971)) or requiring an extended period of experimentation in the absence of sufficient direction or guidance (In re Colianni, 195 USPQ 150 (CCPA 1977)).

Additionally, the courts have determined that “... where a statement is, on its face, contrary to generally accepted scientific principles”, a rejection for failure to teach how to make and/or use is proper (In re Marzocchi, 169 USPQ 367 (CCPA 1971)).

Factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have been described in In re Colianni, 195 USPQ 150, 153 (CCPA 1977), have been clarified by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in Ex parte Forman, 230 USPQ 546 (BPAI 1986), and are summarized in In re Wands (858 F2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed Cir. 1988)). Among the factors are the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the predictability or lack thereof in the art, the amount of direction or guidance present, the presence or absence of working examples, the breadth of the claims, and the quantity of experimentation needed. The instant disclosure fails to meet the enablement requirement for the following reasons:

*The state of the prior art and the predictability or lack thereof in the art:*  
It is impossible to predict the agonist’s combination as presently claimed.

*The amount of direction or guidance present and the presence or absence of working examples:* A reasonable number of examples are not provided in the specification.

Enablement must be provided by the specification unless it is well known in the art. *In re Buchner* 18 USPQ 2d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

*The breadth of the claims and the quantity of experimentation needed:* The claims are too broad and specification does not provide support of broad agonists combination, one skilled in the art would be unable to practice the invention without undue experimentation.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sabiha Qazi whose telephone number is 703-305-3910. The examiner can normally be reached on every business day..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman Page can be reached on 703-308-2927. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-4556 for regular communications and 703-308-4556 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1235.



SABIHA QAZI, PH.D  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

August 8, 2003